DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 040 EA 012 761

AUTHOR	McCleary, Lloyd E.
TITLE	A Critique of Giving Youth a Better Chance. The Recommendations of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies about Education, Work, and Services for Youth.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Va.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Change; *Educational Opportunities; Educational Policy; *Equal Education; Labor Market; *Rural Youth; Secondary Education; Urban Education; Work Experience Programs; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS	*Carnegie Council Policy Studies Higher Education

ABSTRACT

The Carnegie Council Report seeks the reform of educational institutions and the amelioration of conditions faced by disadvantaged and deprived youth. Its guiding principles to achieve reform are to equalize educational opportunity and to increase available options and choices for disadvantaged youth. The 44 recommendations of the report are appended to this paper. According to the critique, although the report provides some rationale or logic from which the recommendations are derived, it is typical of the expose in several respects. It is the "outsider's" view of a particular set of conditions at a particular point in time without knowledge of or concern for the dynamics of the moment or the directions of evolutional development. It assumes that teachers and administrators are inept and that institutions are unresponsive. It provides overgeneralized solutions that may fit no particular set of conditions, and it does not concern itself with underlying causes or with other than immediate effects. Technically, the report leaves several things to be desired. Descriptions of the degree of community involvement in the schools and levels of school crime and vandalism are seriously dated. In addition, the recommendations do not flow from a consistent rationale or from the evidence presented. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187040

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA CE
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

A Critique of

Giving Youth a Better Chance

The Recommendations of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies about Education, Work, and Service for Youth.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NASSP
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 012 761

National Association of Secondary School Principals
Reston, Virginia

Author:
Lloyd E. McCleary is
professor of educational administration,
Graduate School of Education,
University of Utah.

ISBN 0882101064
Copyright © 1980
NASSP
1904 Association Drive
Reston, Va. 22091

Foreword

Reports on secondary education by foundations and citizens commissions are a mixed blessing. They can motivate schools in a helpful way to evaluate their current programs and to seek out improved approaches to schooling. Or, they can spawn criticism that is unfounded and suggest solutions that are impractical.

The recent report on secondary education by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *Giving Youth a Better Chance,* manages to reflect both of these possibilities.

Some elements of the report, such as pointing out the benefits of smaller schools and of work experience to students, are helpful though already generally accepted. Other elements, for example, the outdated rhetoric about schools as prisons, simply do not square with the realities of 1980. In fact, a lack of sufficient structure in secondary schools today may be a larger problem to student achievement than is an excess of structure.

Citizen reports on secondary education often confuse problem youth with problem schools. Somehow, it is supposed, the schools are responsible for adolescent apathy and absenteeism and drug abuse and resentfulness of authority. Quite possibly, however, the causes for malevolent youth are much more pervasive. Perhaps they involve deficiencies in family effectiveness or the culture's popularization of pot or the media's fascination with narcissism. For such social phenomena, the school hardly can be held accountable.

The tendency for some foundation and citizens reports during the 1970s to come at schools from a predetermined, critical posture also is disheartening. An assumption that secondary schools are incapable of renewal is hardly a position from which objective and helpful recommendations can be made for schools to act. It also illustrates, quite candidly, bad psychology if the genuine intent is to improve schools.

This small monograph explores the premise that not all wisdom is contained in reform reports, particularly those generated by persons possessing only a casual relationship with working schools. It was developed by Dr. Lloyd McCleary of

the University of Utah for the Forum of Educational Organization Leaders, an umbrella group representing 20 national organizations working in the field of education, including the NASSP.

We sincerely hope that Dr. McCleary's analysis of *Giving Youth a Better Chance* will give principals and other practitioners a better chance at educating their own constituencies in a constructive manner about the strengths and weaknesses of the report, and about its meaning for secondary education.

Scott D. Thomson
Executive Director

THE CARNEGIE COUNCIL REPORT: REVIEW AND CRITIQUE

Lloyd E. McCleary

Giving Youth a Better Chance: Options for Education, Work, and Service, a report released in 1979 by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, centers upon the labor market and school problems faced by youth, specifically disadvantaged inner-city and rural youth aged 16-21. Its 44 recommendations are based upon a set of considerations that reflect the concerns of the higher education community, and a listing of "essential facts." They are appended to this paper for the reader who wishes to gain an estimate of the scope and nature of the total package.

The tenor of the Carnegie Council Report is reminiscent of earlier examinations of schooling and the problems of youth which have occurred in cycles since World War II. In fact, it cites a series in the latest cycle (the Coleman Report, 1973; the Kettering Foundation report of Task Force 74; and others of that genre) and uses them as one basis of documenting school problems and conditions of youth.

The Carnegie Council Report seeks the reform of educational institutions and the amelioration of conditions faced by disadvantaged and deprived youth. Its guiding principles to achieve reform are: to equalize educational opportunity and to increase available options and choices for disadvantaged youth.

Whether the recommendations will fulfill these principles and achieve favorable changes in conditions faced by youth remains to be judged.

Orientation and Design

Although the report provides some rationale or logic from which the recommendations are derived, it is typical of the exposé in several respects:

1. It is the "outsider's" view of a particular set of conditions at a particular point in time without knowledge of or concern for the dynamics of the moment or the directions of evolutionary development;

2. It assumes the tone of distrust—that teachers and administrators are inept and that institutions are unresponsive and suggests that some prescriptions and a good kick in the pants will produce desired changes;
3. It provides overgeneralized solutions that may fit no particular set of conditions; and
4. It does not concern itself with underlying causes or with other than immediate effects.

Technically the report leaves several things to be desired. Two elements are immediately apparent: (1.) Descriptions of certain basic conditions are seriously dated—community involvement in the schools, crime and vandalism, prevalence of alternatives, etc.; and (2.) The recommendations do not flow from a consistent rationale or from the evidence presented.

A Logistical Approach

Statistics which rely upon grouped data and percentages, or other measures of central tendency, always mask important deviations and countertendencies. In the case of schools and youth this is particularly so. The complexity of schools and communities is something which those who wish to reform education seem to constantly ignore. Composite data assembled to describe complex conditions lead to a logistical approach to problem resolution; to prescriptions for the symptoms, not to cures for the ailment.

A logistical approach leads to the prescription of miracle cures and simplified schemes for improvement. Examine, under the recommendations for schooling, the first four that are directed to school districts:

- 4—voluntary work experience and community service for all students;
- 6—develop a community work study council and provide more adequate placement and counseling;
- 7—shift to a year-round operation;
- 8—emphasize nonacademic activities.

With the exception of a community work study council, school districts have plowed this ground *ad nauseum*. Year-round schools have been tried repeatedly and examined universally by districts since the mid-1950s. Voluntary work and community service is widely employed—in fact, in one city district 72 percent of all seniors hold paying jobs. And a lack of em-

phasis upon nonacademic activities can hardly be charged as a shortcoming of secondary schools. It would be naïve to believe that the determinants of action would not depend upon a large number of conditions, influences, and pressures particular to the local situation. The linear, econometric model of educational change is deficient, and legal or economic pressures to enforce it lead to disruption and imbalances that require later correction. Formula funding with matching is accepted in the report without examination; yet its shortcomings and abuses are well known.

The report notes that schools differ and that effective programs exist under the poorest of conditions, but it ignores the implication. Why not examine the differences between effective and ineffective schools and districts relative to employment of youth, basic skills, and crime prevention? The National Institute of Education (NIE) is currently supporting two such studies (University of Indiana and Columbia University), while another study which might serve as a model has been completed in England (*15,000 Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*, London: Open Books, 1979). Much is known about leadership, staffing, and program development that lead to effective, responsive education for youth, but it is ignored in the report.

A Lack of Perspective

The report represents one view of a very complex and changing scene. Its funding recommendations for the federal government may already be undercut. Stephen Bailey in 1969 observed that studying the educational scene of the '60s and '70s is "like studying modern geography with a pre-World War II textbook and a pre-World War I atlas. The continents are there; the mountains and lakes and rivers are there; but nothing else is the same."

We need better projections using adequate trend analysis techniques, and we need to target *where* the changes of importance will occur—city by city, state by state. Secondary education has a primary role to assist youth, both in the transition to the world of work and in relation to life conditions. Schools are not the source or cause of youth problems. What is needed is the provision of resources to assist each school to develop programs and services to be responsive to youth in their community settings.

3.

Teachers and administrators need to understand and place in perspective existing social and economic forces which will continue to shape life and education in our urban communities. As David Tyak notes in his history of urban education (*The One Best System,* Harvard, 1974):

> Substantial segments of this society no longer believe in centralism as an effective response to human needs, no longer trust an enlightened paternalism of elites and experts, no longer accept the inevitability or justice of the distribution of power and wealth along existing class and racial lines. To create urban schools which really teach students, which reflect the pluralism of the society, which serve the quest for social justice—this is a task which will take persistent imagination, wisdom and will.

The report is content with the position that "We are concerned about the need for more attention to the trade-off between adequate recources devoted to in-school youth and rescue operations for out-of-school youth."

My experience in close contact with many urban districts and recently in directing "site conferences" of high school principals across the country (NASSP's *The Senior High School Principalship: The Summary Report,* 1979) leads me to believe that our secondary schools are as open, adaptable, and responsive as any of our public institutions. Teachers and administrators realize they must share decision-making power, that they need to make extra efforts to reach ethnic and minority groups, that they need to match programs and learning styles of individual students (NASSP's *LearningStyles,* 1980), and that the dysfunctions of bureaucratic structure must be bypassed. Shortcomings stem largely from efforts to solve social and economic problems through a variety of programs and services, primarily noneducational in character, which tend to equate all schools and reduce them to a single standard.

A mismatch exists between what we would like to do as educators and what we are forced to do as teachers, managers, and designers of educational programs. Social, economic, and political realities affect the form schools have taken and produce the sometimes seemingly meaningless and arbitrary constraints which we all experience. Yet, there is a functional utility to most, if not all, of the practices that have endured; a utility that is often overlooked by those who would rid schools of what they take to be unnecessary evils.

4.

BASIC CONDITIONS

Schools and urban communities cannot take lightly the intolerably high incidence of dropouts, absenteeism, crime and drugs, and alcohol abuse. Data from the report are within the limits of other available data: i.e., NASSP's national principalship study which provides data on dropouts and absenteeism (1978), and Ianni and Ianni's *School Crime and the Social Order of the School* (1978), among others.

Disruptions do deplete resources and affect the school's basic function of teaching and socialization of youth. The problem of analysis hinges upon what incidents are basic to school, even school caused or facilitated, and what incidents are a reflection of home and community life.

Trouble in the youth years, wherever it occurs, seems to be treated as a school problem. Hence, even the Senate Committee on School Disorder (1974) reported a serious escalation in school crime when there was and continues to be a decrease in crime and disruption in schools. The point is not to question the data or to mitigate the seriousness of it, but to suggest: (1) that schools can control and significantly reduce the conditions noted above, can even resist external social conditions; and (2) that the treatments must vary and that funding and supportive programs need to be *targeted* in terms of the school and community's specific needs.

Youth employment and youth work experience programs treated by the report are needed and could be effective, particularly in Recommendations 9 (vocational education), 21 (FIPSE), 22 ("Trio"), 31 (apprenticeship programs), 33 (occupational orientation programs), and 34 (work for inner-city youth). Consultation with several state directors of vocational education and a review of information supplied by them indicate the need and feasibility of such programs, and suggest that these programs could be strengthened by the recommended actions.

In several important areas the report reveals a singular lack of understanding of what schools are already doing. For example, in the matter of alternatives and options, the report recommends that all districts study alternatives. At least one in three of all districts in the nation have one or more alternative schools in operation. More than three-fourths of all high schools operate summer schools; two-thirds have off-campus work or

on-the-job training; two-thirds have night and/or continuation classes; more than half offer contract and independent study credit; slightly less than half have college courses taught at a nearby college specifically for high school students; one-fourth offer college level courses in the high school; and one-fifth have school-sponsored community volunteer programs.

In terms of vocational training, federally funded vocational education programs exist in three-fourths of the high schools; two-thirds have Title I (ESEA) programs; and one-third have career education programs. In Utah, only 11 percent of the vocational education funds of all types in high schools are federally funded. This state is deficient in skilled and semi-skilled workers. (There are more than 36,000 new job openings each year; one-fourth of these must be filled from outside the state.) Hence, youth employment is not the serious problem that it is in some urban areas, but again the problem is a selective one and needs to be treated as such.

The fact that vocational education needs revision and support, as the report indicates, is not altered by these facts. However, the imbalances cited are largely the result of the weaknesses of formula funding and the zealousness of interest groups who have seized upon funding opportunities to influence adoption of programs which may not be in the best interest of the total school program.

The Recommendations

Chapter 20 of the report, "Who Should Do What?" provides a more realistic and defensible set of actions than do the actual recommendations themselves. Further, had the recommendations been restricted to and based upon disadvantaged youth—locating them demographically, analyzing their condition and the causal factors of their problems, targeting needs and programs—the resulting recommendations would be more useful in calling upon governments, institutions of higher education, and the public schools to share in the improvement of these conditions. Government and institutions would be better able to examine current programs, match them to needs, balance priorities, and respond.

The recommendations are a list of prescriptions which mix the important with the unimportant, ask for consideration of already well-examined actions, and introduce irrelevant, super-

ficial, and/or confusing items. Items within each category are now selected for specific attention by way of illustration. Some reactions to specific recommendations already have been made.

School leaving

Recommendation 1, set compulsory attendance age at 16 is a state matter that, when considered in terms of effects, is perhaps meaningless. Only nine states have a compulsory attendance age set at 17 or 18. In Utah, which has a leaving age of 18, youth can leave for any number of reasons. Principals indicate that a school leaving age of 16 would be relatively meaningless and would in most cases serve to terminate contacts schools now have with youth who are in trouble.

Recommendation 2, options for post-16-age youth, is treated in other recommendations (i.e., 20, 22, 32, 37).

Recommendation 3, follow-up services for two years, deserves consideration since most school districts have placement and counseling services; but in many locations, a duplication of job service and other agencies would require cooperative effort and funding considerations.

Schooling

Recommendations 4, 6, 7, 8 have been mentioned as district matters, to which might be added Recommendation 11 (review alternative school plans), Recommendation 12 (ensure that racial integration is not jeopardized), Recommendation 15 (encourage pregnant girls to continue education). All are well recognized, internalized as standard practice and evaluated periodically, or required by legislation in most states. Recommendation 8 is an example of the ill-conceived nature of some of the recommendations. It reads: *Emphasis on nonacademic activities is essential in all secondary schools, especially in situations in which work-experience programs encounter difficulties.* How nonacademic activities can correct difficulties in work-experience programs escapes me, even though I am a firm advocate of activities that produce positive attitudes toward school.

Recommendations 5 and 9 (extend work/study programs to age 16 and merge vocational education and work study programs) are commendable. Why not treat them as one and develop the proper logic for supporting them?

Recommendations 10, 13, 14 (Departments of Labor and Education coordinate manpower and education programs, give

principal responsibility for change at the school level, and teacher organizations should support innovation) are commendable in principle and perhaps should be left at that. However, the realities of these kinds of prescriptive principles leave all sorts of "it depends" conditions which the report fails to take into account.

Recommendations 16 and 17 (opposition to tuition tax credits and small-scale experiments with voucher plans) could well result in the conditions claimed and should be supported. However, it must be noted that voucher plans have been tried and have received a mixed reaction.

Recommendations 18 through 28—with the exception of Recommendation 20 relating to middle colleges, Recommendation 24 (reform of teacher training), and Recommendation 26 (training of school administrators)—deal with funding to institutions of higher education. Middle colleges appear to be in a generally poor position relative to competing programs. With declining enrollments and the improvements recommended, the need for another institution is questionable. The reform of teacher training and the training of school administrators are subjects treated far more thoroughly and competently elsewhere. Again, Recommendations 23 (colleges establish offices of community service), 27 (colleges train community coordinators of youth programs), and 28 (states increase aid to local schools) are commendable on their own but depend upon complex and unpredictable realities of institutional and state government decision making.

Employment/Service

Recommendations 29 through 40 represent proposals which could alleviate employment problems of youth and widen opportunities for them. These need more careful analysis than the resources available to this review. The report claims that opportunities represented in this group of proposals would, with the declining youth population, largely resolve the problems of disadvantaged youth and alleviate to some extent the plight of the deprived. Concerns about the report's lack of attention to causal factors and to detailed analysis of demography and actual program operation have already been noted. Whether these steps would further weaken, rather than strengthen, existing institutions and programs remains a matter for debate.

8.

Observations

The report does not examine, except in the consideration of options and school size, what is required to improve schools and the quality of education provided by them. The following comments are brief and can be extended in discussion from original sources, which are cited.

1. The political-economic structures which exercise powerful controls over schools will become the focus of an accelerating struggle during the next decade. Large metropolitan school districts (as well as municipal governments) have encountered major constraints in pursuing the principle of equality while attempting to provide differentiated services and programs. Efforts to reduce inequalities result in reducing efficiency and choice—increasing the flight to the suburbs, tax revolts, voucher proposals, etc. The opposition contends that a decentralized system provides a basis for competition and choice and argues that the mobility of households increases the quality and variety of governmental and educational services available. Each side is becoming more active and sophisticated. Schools cannot resolve this issue and may face a further reduced capability to respond to the educational needs of all youth. See, for example, William Boyd, "The Political Economy of Education in Metropolitan Areas: Dilemmas of Reform and Public Choice," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 2:1, 1980.

2. Against the broader political-economic struggle is the matter of the interface between the individual school and its community. The area of school-community involvement is ill-defined and poorly understood by high school principals, teachers, and parents. There are not only the questions surrounding community involvement and participation in decision making and in the school's programs, but also of strengthening support for students in the home. The latter is directly related to achievement and success in schools. Studies indicate six groups of family support characteristics are related to school success:

- Achievement Press—parent aspirations, interest in and knowledge of standards for learner achievement, etc.

- Language Models—quality of parents' language and standards desired for youth.
- Academic Guidance—availability and quality of guidance, nurturing.
- Activeness—extent and content of family indoor and outdoor activities.
- Intellectuality—nature of thinking and intellectual activities.
- Work Habits—routine home management and shared educational activities, provisions for general learning.

We need to find links to home and community at a time when traditional communication links are disappearing.

3. The teacher has been largely ignored as the critical factor in the debate over educational quality except in terms of teaching competence. This focus assumes the teacher to be a standardized entity; yet we know that teachers are as individualistic as are students. If teaching is to improve, the conditions under which teachers choose and pursue careers in teaching need examination. A career in teaching is not as standardized and simplistic as might be first assumed. Motives, aspirations, satisfactions, career steps and strategies, institutional demands and opportunities, and social and economic conditions represent only a few variables. Little improvement in the corps of teachers will take place until a career in teaching can be made attractive enough, throughout all stages, to attract, develop, and retain the best. Burnout, which has become a popular topic, may actually be "opt out" to more attractive vocations.

4. School leadership, especially from the principal, is cited repeatedly as the key to quality schools. The report notes it; every report I have read on school improvement notes it. In NASSP's principalship study, one-third of the identified "effective principals" left the principalship (one-half of these left public education) within a two-year period. The loss of both effective principals and teachers is alarming. An intensive examination of school-based management and leadership requirements is needed.

10.

5. School climates have been studied only superficially. The British study, *15,000 Hours*, and the two studies in progress in the United States should be carefully reviewed, and the follow-up actions they suggest should be undertaken.

6. School and class size, a matter of inconclusive debate, should be given another look. School size appears to be important in regard to several conditions, including crime and violence, education of the disadvantaged and ethnic minorities, innovation, and positive parent attitudes toward school. Class size recently has been intensively investigated using new techniques of meta-analysis. Smith and Glass (Far West Lab, 1979), have found class size to be significantly related to achievement, learning environment, student attitudes and behavior, and teacher satisfaction. They report, "As class size increases, achievement decreases. The difference in being taught in a class of 20 versus a class of 40 is an advantage of 10 percentile ranks. . . . Few resources at the command of educators will reliably produce effects of that magnitude."

The list could be extended, but these are subjects which are not being considered, or taken seriously, by those who would reform our schools. John Gardner said "Education suffers from the double dilemma of unloving critics and uncritical lovers." Let us avoid either classification so that education can prosper.

Recommendations

1. The legal age for the end of compulsory schooling should be no later than the 16th birthday. States with a higher school-leaving age should revise their legislation, but they may need to plan for gradual implementation so that opportunities for training, community service, and other activities for those who leave formal schooling at age 16 can be expanded.

2. Beyond the sixteenth birthday, a young person should have the option of proceeding to (1) additional secondary schooling and work options, (2) middle college and work options, (3) community college and work options, (4) apprenticeships, (5) work or training programs, or (6) youth service.

Each of the options available to 16- and 17-year-olds should lead to any of the options available at age 18 or older.

3. The responsibilities of secondary schools for school-leavers should not end at age 16. School districts should be required to ensure that those leaving school have acquired basic skills or are provided with opportunities for making up their deficiencies. School districts should also ensure that school-leavers are referred to appropriate education, training, work, or service programs and should follow the progress of school-leavers for at least two years after their departure from school.

4. School districts should develop plans to provide voluntary opportunities for combinations of work experience, community service, and education for all of their students, especially in the last two years of high school.

5. To meet the needs of students from lower-income and lower-middle-income families, who may have difficulty finding employment through normal labor market channels, a federal-state work-study program for secondary school students aged 16 to 19 should be established, modeled on the College Work-Study program. We recommend an initial federal appropriation of $300 million.

6. To carry out a broad-gauged work-experience program and to help meet employment needs of school dropouts and graduates, every school district should take the initiative in stimulating the development of a community work-education council if none exists. In addition, much more adequate placement and counseling services are a need that should be given high priority in all school districts.

7. School systems should seriously consider shifting to year-round operation where they are not now on such a schedule.

8. Emphasis on nonacademic activities is essential in all secondary schools, especially in situations in which work-experience programs encounter difficulties.

8. Emphasis on nonacademic activities is essential in all secondary schools, especially in situations in which work-experience programs encounter difficulties.

9. The federal Vocational Education Act should be renamed the Occupational Skills and Work-Study Act, and its provisions should be merged with those for the work-study program that we have recommended.

The legislation should be amended to provide approximately $300 million of existing federal vocational education funds for 75 percent matching grants to the states to stimulate the development of programs that move skills training out of the high school classroom and into the workplace or community college.

10. The U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should cooperate in developing policies for encouraging coordination of manpower and education programs for youth at the state and local levels and in seeking removal of legislative and administrative obstacles, such as differing eligibility conditions, to such coordination.

11. School districts throughout the United States should develop local planning efforts, where they have not done so, aimed at determining whether magnet schools, alternative schools, or schools-within-schools are needed.

12. Plans for restructuring schools should ensure that racial integration will be encouraged, rather than jeopardized, through the development of new types of schools.

13. Boards of education and superintendents should give the principal of each school where change is to occur clear responsibility for planning and carrying out the change, in consultation with teachers, parents, and students.

14. Teachers' organizations should support innovation and play an active role in carrying it out.

15. Every school district should make certain that its secondary schools have programs, in cooperation with other community agencies, that encourage girls who become pregnant to complete their education.

16. The Council opposes tuition tax credits at the elementary and secondary level, just as we have opposed them at the postsecondary level, and for many of the same reasons. At the elementary and secondary level, they (1) may well be declared unconstitutional, (2) would help all parents with children in private schools regardless of need, and (3) might encourage a massive shift to private schools.

17. Small-scale experiments with voucher plans should be encouraged, especially experiments that are limited to public schools, but there should be no large-scale or statewide adoptions of voucher plans until the results of such experiments have been evaluated.

18. The federal government should modify its policy of allocating meager funds to secondary schools under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act by increasing funding under the act specifically for the purpose of benefiting secondary schools. We suggest an initial increase for this purpose of $500 million in 1980-81.

19. Colleges and universities in large metropolitan areas should seek opportunities to contribute to improving the quality of secondary school programs in their areas, preferably through joining in a community-wide pairing plan like the one in Boston.

20. Community colleges should (1) cooperate with CETA and school authorities in the development of training and work-experience programs, (2) experiment with admitting students at age 16 and with the development of middle colleges, (3) provide opportunities for high school students to participate in their occupational programs, and (4) develop more opportunities for cooperative education and apprenticeship for both secondary and postsecondary students.

Comprehensive colleges should assume these responsibilities in communities that lack a community college.

21. The annual appropriation for FIPSE should be increased from the $14 million included in the administration's fiscal year 1980 budget to $20 million in fiscal year 1981, under provisions that would allocate the additional $6 million to projects designed to serve disadvantaged youth.

22. The federal government should continue to support the Trio programs and gradually increase their funding. We suggest an increase from $130 million in 1979-80 to $150 million (in constant 1979 dollars) in 1980-81.

23. Especially on larger campuses, colleges and universities should coordinate participation of students in community service by establishing offices of community service.

24. The time has come for colleges and universities involved in teacher training to take decisive steps to reform that training to meet the changing needs of the schools in the 1980s. The president of the institution should take the lead in ensuring such changes if the school of education is resisting change.

25. The federal government should continue to support the Teacher Corps, and the appropriation for the program should be increased from $37.5 million in 1979-80 to $40 million (in constant dollars) in 1980-81.

26. Schools of education should give special attention to improving the training of school administrators, especially by giving preference to candidates for advanced degrees who have had varied types of teaching experience, and by developing programs in school management in cooperation with schools of business or public administration.

27. Universities should develop interdisciplinary programs at the master's level for training community coordinators of programs for youth.

28. The states should take advantage of declining enrollment growth by increasing state aid to local school districts, with particular attention to the needs of secondary schools. States that are below the national average in the percentage of personal income flowing to the public schools have a special need to review their school financing policies.

29. Teenagers should be exempted from social security coverage.

30. Federal government programs for training and employment of youth should place strong emphasis on efforts to involve private employers, especially through encouraging participation of employers in work-education councils and through provision of training subsidies, but wage subsidies should be limited to modest experimental programs.

31. Federal and state programs to increase the number of apprenticeable occupations, to include more women and minorities in apprenticeship programs, to develop apprenticeship programs in the civil and military services, to seek the cooperation of community colleges in apprenticeship training, and to open up apprenticeship opportunities for secondary school students should continue.

32. The U.S. Department of Defense, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor, should stimulate the development of premilitary training.

33. CETA prime sponsors, schools, and community colleges should cooperate in making certain that opportunities for occupational orientation programs are available for both in-school and out-of-school youth.

34. The U.S. Department of Labor should encourage the development of a program that would provide full-time work to inner-city youth, through contract service organizations that would regularize the odd-job labor market, using a combination of public and private funds.

35. The U.S. Department of Labor should provide support for pilot projects under which CETA prime sponsors would provide lump-sum payments to disadvantaged youth who stay on the job at several intervals during the first six months of employment.

36. The states should review protective legislation, compulsory attendance laws, and other legislation to remove unnecessary barriers to employment of youth.

37. In the future development of training programs for out-of-school youth, greater emphasis should be placed on flexibility in the duration of programs and in the types of training provided.

38. Public and private agencies should cooperate in sponsoring and funding programs for the deprived, expanding program designs that have been successful and discontinuing those that have failed or shown limited success.

39. In the event of a substantial rise in the unemployment rate in 1980, funds allocated to the U.S. Department of Labor for special youth programs should be augmented by $500 million, to be expended primarily on civil service apprenticeship programs at all levels of government and on public service employment.

40. Nevertheless, the long-run goal should be to increase the percentage of funds expended on in-school youth in CETA youth programs, as success is achieved in reducing school dropout rates and unemployment rates of out-of-school youth.

41. We recommend establishment of a National Youth Service in which participation would be voluntary, and all young people aged 16 to 24 would be eligible. Although a National Youth Service Foundation would be responsible for development of the program, projects would be initiated and administered on a decentralized basis.

42. One-half of the federal funds allocated for the program should call for 50 percent matching by the agency initiating the program. Such an agency would typically be a local community group, but it might also be a state agency or a consortium of institutions of higher education.

The initiating agency might seek a portion of the matching amount from state agencies or foundations.

43. We suggest an initial federal allocation of $600 million in 1980-81, which we estimate would accommodate 135,000 to 140,000 volunteers initially, including those already in ACTION and allowing for augmentation of funds through the matching provisions.

44. We favor the establishment of a National Education Fund in which credits could be established for individual youth and adults from five sources: (1) voluntary savings by participants in youth service programs, (2) federal educational credits for youth service, (3) employer deposits on behalf of employees, (4) voluntary savings by employees up to age 55, and (5) contributions by parents on behalf of their children.